REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claim 18 has been canceled. Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 10, 15 to 17, 19 to 26, 28, and 31 to 35 have been amended (strikeouts and brackets indicating deleted text and underlining indicating added text). No new matter has been added. Claims 1 to 17 and 19 to 35 are now pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Examiner's Note Regarding Claims 33 to 35

The Examiner incorrectly asserts that the means recited in the claims do not invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 since the only structural features described in the Specification are computer program modules. However, the Specification describes computer systems, e.g., as shown in figures 8 and 9, programmed with software for performing the steps recited in claims 33 to 35. Accordingly, the Specification discloses sufficient structural limitations for interpretation of claims 33 to 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6.

III. Rejection of Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly indefinite.

The Examiner asserts that the claim scope of claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 are uncertain because "a trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product." Office Action, p. 2. However, this is not a universally applicable rule. Instead, where the trademark has a fixed and definite meaning, it constitutes sufficient identification, and the matter of sufficiency of disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* M.P.E.P. § 608.01(v). The Java programming language is not merely a trademark but rather identifies a particular type of programming language, and the identification of a language as the Java language is a clear one. Nevertheless, to facilitate matters, claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 have each been amended herein without prejudice to recite an object-oriented and platform independent programming language, instead of Java, which is known to have those features, thus obviating the present rejection.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV.   **Rejection of Claims 17 to 24 and 25 to 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 17 to 24 and 25 to 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as assertedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17 and 25 have been amended herein without prejudice to obviate the present rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

V.   **Rejection of Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 14, 16 to 22, 24**
        to 30, and 32 to 35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 14, 16 to 22, 24 to 30, and 32 to 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0133546 ("the Oni reference"). The Oni reference does not anticipate these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claim 18 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby obviating the present rejection with respect to claim 18.

To reject a claim as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (*See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As explained herein, the Office Action does not meet this standard as to all of the features of the claims.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method of managing visibility of GUI components in an application, and, as herein amended without prejudice, provides for providing a user interface of a visibility manager for selection, for each of a plurality of profiles, of one of a plurality of visibility states for each of at least a subset of the GUI components. Claim 1 further provides that display of the GUI components are determined by the visibility manager based on the selected visibility states.

The Oni reference, on the other hand, refers to background AI functionality by which an interface layout is dynamically tailored to user behavior captured by automatic assessments and general user-indicated preferences. *See* the Oni reference, par. 65. The Oni reference does not provide a user input interface for receiving explicit visibility selections for GUI components for one or more statically maintained profiles.

Therefore, the Oni reference does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1, and does not anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims, e.g., claims 2 to 6 and 8.

Claim 9 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 9 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 10 to 14 and 16, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 17 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 19 to 22 and 24, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 25 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 25 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 26 to 30 and 32, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 33 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 33 and its dependent claims, i.e., claims 34 and 35, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of this anticipation rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VI.   Rejection of Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of the Oni reference and U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 ("the Moshfeghi reference"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Oni and Moshfeghi references does not render unpatentable these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33, respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, since the secondary Moshfeghi reference does not correct the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to the Oni reference. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VII.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that any outstanding rejections of the claims should be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2007   By: /_____/
                                            Aaron Grunberger
                                            Reg. No. 59,210

                                            KENYON & KENYON LLP
                                            One Broadway
                                            New York, NY 10004
                                            Telephone: (212) 425-7200

                                            CUSTOMER NO. 23838